

light up when they saw the face of the Chaplain and how he was never in too much hurry not to stop and have a good word or two of greeting for each and every person.

He was truly a Chaplain not just for 100 Senators but for all of the broad Senate family and for those in some sudden need who were just here as visitors as well.

As he retires and leave us, my own remembrance, my own memory of him will be of a man who comes closer in character to what we read about when we read about the saints and the great religious leaders in history, that he partakes of more of those qualities than any other individual whom I have been privileged to know, not just during my career here but during my life.

Chaplain Halverson, at some different time and some different place, might well end up being nominated a saint because his character was and remains a saintly character, who brings joy and sustenance and strength and peace into the lives of all with whom he associates.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank both of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I also thank Senator DOLE, the majority leader, for his thoughtfulness in asking Senators to come to the floor today, to come to the Chamber and to be present when Dr. Halverson uttered his last prayer here in the Chamber. I think that was a very good thing to do, and I appreciate very much the majority leader's having done that, and told him so when he was here earlier.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

DR. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I hope before the clock starts to tick that I can take 15 seconds to speak about Pastor Halverson, and to remind everybody that Pastor Halverson is just retiring as Chaplain for the U.S. Senate. He is not retiring from being a pastor for people. He is not retiring from being a servant for the Lord.

This morning, I asked him to pray for me, and as I have done for the last 14 years, I will continue to pray for his work daily because I know that work will continue.

CONCERNING PRESIDENTIAL ETHICS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, President Clinton was asked, at his most recent news conference, how he could explain the ethical controversies

surrounding his administration—and these are the words of an inquiring press—" * * * after [he] came into office promising the most ethical administration in history."

I wanted to take this opportunity to discuss how the President reacted to that inquiry at his news conference.

First, he responded to allegations about Roger Altman's ethical troubles. President Clinton stated that:

Roger Altman resigned even though he had violated no law and no rule of ethics.

There are two problems with that statement. First, Roger Altman resigned because bipartisan members of the Senate Banking Committee found that he misled Congress in sworn testimony. I hope that President Clinton did not mean to suggest that misleading Congress in sworn testimony is ethical.

And, second, Altman did not really resign. Several months later, he was still performing functions for the Treasury Department.

That is not the commitment to ethics that the President promised the American people.

President Clinton also mentioned former Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy. The President said that Secretary Espy's actions involved " * * * a few thousand dollars, all of which he has reimbursed."

I think Secretary Espy made a number of significant contributions as Agriculture Secretary. But, once again, I have to take issue with the President. The purity of the Nation's food supply is vital. Laws have been on the books for decades to prevent the Agriculture Department personnel from taking any payment that might influence their decisions regarding food product safety. And ethics is about the adherence to rules. The fact that amounts involved might have been petty may relate to appropriate punishments. But it does not relate to or excuse an ethics violation, if one occurred.

The President's comments that Mr. Espy is the only Cabinet Secretary to resign based on ethics challenges to actions taken while in office is technically true. But this is only because Commerce Secretary Ron Brown has not resigned. It is simply not true, as the President has repeatedly said, that the charges relating to Secretary Brown concern only his conduct prior to taking office. Significant ethical issues arise from the manner in which he reported various financial transactions on his ethics disclosure forms once he assumed office. Various conflicts of interest are alleged to have arisen after he became Secretary of Commerce as well.

I am also concerned that the President seems to think that somehow it is a matter of less concern that a person in his administration is accused of ethical conduct prior to joining his administration than afterward. What does that say about the vetting process that was followed?

Does the President suggest that the ethics of a person he chose for his administration matter only with respect to actions they took while in office? Remember, Vice President Agnew resigned because of actions he took prior to assuming that office.

I think that it is not asking too much of the President, who promised the toughest ethical standards in history, that his appointees be ethical in their current positions and that they have records of acting ethically.

However, the President said that we are "creating a climate here in which a lot of people will be reluctant to serve." Let me make crystal clear that, in fact, we are trying to create a climate in which people who are not ethical, including a number this President has appointed, are very reluctant to serve.

President Clinton also said that under the independent counsel law investigations cannot be controlled. The President said that if a certain number of Members of Congress ask for an independent counsel, then the prospect of a counsel is triggered. Mr. President, I am pleased to have supported the independent counsel law over many years in times of both Republican and Democrat Presidents. President Clinton made reauthorization of that statute a priority, so he should not complain about that law.

But we should be clear about the terms of the statute. A particular number of Senators cannot demand that an independent counsel be appointed. What Members of Congress can do is force the Attorney General to conduct an investigation and to make a decision. But the decision to ask for an independent counsel is the Attorney General's alone.

For instance, a majority of Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee wrote the Attorney General to ask that an independent counsel be appointed to prosecute Ira Magaziner on the contempt charges arising from the health care task force litigation that the Justice Department defended. Attorney General Reno conducted an investigation, but she decided not to ask for the appointment of an independent counsel. In the other instances in which an independent counsel was appointed, it was the President's own Attorney General who sought the appointment because the circumstances warranted it. Members of Congress cannot force an appointment.

President Clinton also said that with respect to his administration, "You would be hard pressed to cite examples that constitute abuse of authority." In fact, it is very easy in regard to the health care reform task force. A violation of the Federal Advisory Committee Act by the health care task force is one example. Failure to immediately put assets in a blind trust, as all other recent Presidents did, while those assets included a fund that shorted health care stocks, is a second example. A third example is Travelgate;